Office (GPO) document entitled ''General Wage Determinations Issued Under The Davis-Bacon And Related Acts,'' shall be the minimum paid by contractors and subcontractors to laborers and mechanics.

Any person, organization, or governmental agency having an interest in the rates determined as prevailing is encouraged to submit wage rate and fringe benefit information for consideration by the Department. Further information and self-explanatory forms for the purpose of submitting this data may be obtained by writing to the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Wage and Hour Division, Division of Wage Determinations, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room S–3014, Washington, D.C. 20210.

New General Wage Determination Decisions

The number of the decisions added to the Government Printing Office document entitled ''General Wage Determinations Issued Under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts'' are listed by Volume and State:

Volume II

Virginia
VA950114 (Oct. 20, 1995)
VA950115 (Oct. 20, 1995)

Modifications to General Wage Determination Decisions

The number of decisions listed in the Government Printing Office document entitled ''General Wage Determinations Issued Under the Davis-Bacon and Related Acts'' being modified are listed by Volume and State. Dates of publication in the Federal Register are in parentheses following the decisions being modified.

Volume I

New Jersey
NJ950003 (Feb. 10, 1995)

Volume II

Washington
DC950003 (Feb. 10, 1995)
Virginia
VA950104 (Feb. 10, 1995)
Index

Volume III

None

Volume IV

Michigan
MI950001 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950002 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950003 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950004 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950005 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950007 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950012 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950031 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950046 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950049 (Feb. 10, 1995)
MI950060 (Feb. 10, 1995)
Wisconsin
WI950002 (Feb. 10, 1995)

Volume V

None

Volume VI

California
CA950028 (Feb. 10, 1995)
CA950030 (Feb. 10, 1995)
Colorado
CO950004 (Feb. 10, 1995)
CO950006 (Feb. 10, 1995)
CO950007 (Feb. 10, 1995)
CO950009 (Feb. 10, 1995)
CO950014 (Feb. 10, 1995)
Nevada
NV950002 (Feb. 10, 1995)

General Wage Determination Publication

General wage determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts, including those noted above, may be found in the Government Printing Office (GPO) document entitled ''General Wage Determinations Issued Under The Davis-Bacon and Related Acts''. This publication is available at each of the 50 Regional Government Depository Libraries and many of the 1,400 Government Depository Libraries across the county.

The general wage determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts are available electronically by subscription to the FedWorld Bulletin Board System of the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) of the U.S. Department of Commerce at (703) 487–4630.

Hard-copy subscriptions may be purchased from: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402, (2020 512–1800.

Whe ordering hard-copy subscription(s), be sure to specify the State(s) of interest, since, subscriptions may be ordered for any or all of the six separate volumes, arranged by State. Subscriptions include an annual edition (issued in January or February) which includes all current general wage determinations for the States covered by each volume. Throughout the remainder of the year, regular weekly updates are distributed to subscribers.

Signed at Washington, D.C. that 13th day of October 1995.

Philip J. Gloss,

Chief, Branch of Construction Wage Determinations.

[FR Doc. 95–25914 Filed 10–19–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–27–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40–8027]

Decommissioning of Sequoyah Fuels Corporation Uranium Conversion Facility in Gore, Oklahoma: Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and To Conduct a Scoping Process

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SUMMARY: The NRC intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the decommissioning of the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation's (SFC) uranium conversion facility located in Gore, Oklahoma. From 1970 until 1993, SFC operated a uranium conversion facility at a site located in Gore, Oklahoma, under the authority of an NRC license issued pursuant to 10 CFR part 40. The main process was the conversion of uranium oxide (yellowcake) to uranium hexafluoride. A second process, begun in 1987, consisted of the conversion of depleted uranium hexafluoride to uranium tetrafluoride.

SFC supplied formal notice of its intent to seek license termination in accordance with 10 CFR 40.42(e) in a letter dated February 16, 1993. Based on available information, at least some of the identified waste and contamination at the site is known to exceed NRC's existing radiological criteria for decommissioning. Therefore, SFC is required to remediate the SFC facility to meet the NRC's decommissioning criteria, as described in the Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP) Action Plan (April 16, 1992, 57 FR 13389). In the Preliminary Plan for the Completion of Decommissioning of February 1993, however, SFC identified on-site disposal using the criteria developed for uranium mill tailings sites (10 CFR part 40, appendix A), as appropriate for the SFC facility because of similarity of materials at the mills and at SFC. The uranium mill tailings criteria exceed the criteria has generally found acceptable for decommissioning nuclear facilities other than uranium mill tailings disposal sites.

This notice indicates NRC's intent to prepare an EIS in conjunction with this proposed action and to conduct a scoping process that will include a public scoping meeting. The EIS will consider the licensee's proposed approach for onsite disposal along with alternatives. NRC will consider the EIS in reaching a decision on the acceptability of the licensee's proposed approach.

DATES: Written comments on matters covered by this notice received by March 29, 1996, will be considered in developing the scope of the EIS. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date. The comment period has been extended to allow public consideration of important site characterization information, which is expected to be submitted to NRC and other agencies in December 1995 and January 1996.

A public scoping meeting will be held at the Gore High School Auditorium in Gore, Oklahoma on November 15, 1995 from 7 to 10 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the matters covered by this notice and/or the scoping meeting should be sent to: Rules Review and Directives Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. ATTN: Docketing and Services Branch. Hand deliver comments to 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m., on Federal workdays.

The scoping meeting will be held in the auditorium of the Gore, Oklahoma High School, Gore, OK on November 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jim Shepherd, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone: 301–415–6712 or 800–368–5462; fax 301–415–6712; e-mail JCS2@NRC.GOV.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The NRC has the statutory responsibility for protection of public health and safety and the environment related to the use of source, byproduct, and special nuclear material under the Atomic Energy Act. The NRC believes that one portion of this responsibility is to assure safe and timely decommissioning of nuclear facilities which it licenses. This responsibility can be partially fulfilled by providing guidance to licensees on how to plan for and prepare their sites for decommissioning. Decommissioning, as defined in the NRC's regulations in 10 CFR 40.4, for example, means to remove nuclear facilities safely from service and to reduce residual radioactivity to a level that permits release of the property for unrestricted use and termination of the license.

Once licensed activities have ceased, licensees are required, in existing NRC regulations, to decommission their facilities so that their licenses can be terminated. This requires that radioactivity in buildings, equipment, soil, groundwater, and surface water resulting from the licensed operation be reduced to acceptably low levels that allow the property to be released for unrestricted use. Licensees must then demonstrate, by a site radiological survey, that residual contamination in all facilities and environmental media have been properly reduced or eliminated and that, except for any residual radiological contamination found to be acceptable to remain at the site, radioactive material has been transferred to authorized recipients. Confirmatory surveys are conducted by NRC, where appropriate, to verify that sites meet NRC radiological criteria for decommissioning.

Need for Proposed Action

From 1970 until 1993, SFC operated a uranium conversion facility at a site located in Gore, Oklahoma, under the authority of an NRC license issued pursuant to 10 CFR part 40. The main process was the conversion of uranium oxide (yellowcake) to uranium hexafluoride. A second process, begun in 1987, consisted of the conversion of depleted uranium hexafluoride to uranium tetrafluoride. In November 1992, following an uncontrolled release of nitrous oxide from the main process, SFC notified the NRC that SFC had terminated operations. At this same time, SFC stated they would not restart the main process of yellowcake conversion, and that SFC would cease all conversion processes by July 1993.

During the time of operations, SFC disposed of contaminated material in trenches, constructed and utilized numerous settling and storage ponds, and spilled radioactive material into the ground contaminating surrounding soil and groundwater. In response to concerns about the extent of environmental contamination in the early 1990s, SFC developed a Facility Environmental Investigation (FEI). The FEI provides detailed information about the extent of contamination at the facility. SFC is also conducting a comprehensive site characterization program to identify existing radiological and chemical contamination in partial fulfillment of NRC and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirements.

On August 4, 1993, SFC and EPA, Region VI, signed an Administrative Order on Consent, establishing a schedule for compliance with Section 3008(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. In partial fulfillment of that order, SFC is collecting and assessing information on site characteristics. SFC is required to submit its site characterization report to EPA in December 1995.

SFC is also conducting additional site characterization in fulfillment of NRC's decommissioning requirements. This additional information will supplement currently available information described in the FEI and other site documents. SFC has committed to provide NRC with this additional site characterization information in January 1996.

NRC and EPA are cooperating in the regulatory review of the decommissioning and remediation of the SFC facility. In September 1995, the agencies completed a Memorandum of Understanding that describes the respective roles and responsibilities of the agencies along with procedures for coordination oversight activities.

The SFC facility has been listed in NRC's Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP) because NRC has determined that it warrants special NRC oversight to ensure timely and safe decommissioning. The SFC facility is contaminated with radioactive materials, including depleted and natural uranium. Specifically, the site contains large amounts of contaminated soil, unused settling ponds, and burial grounds for radioactive waste that may be difficult to decommission. In addition, the site has also been listed in the SDMP because there is groundwater contamination from onsite wastes and the ability of SFC to pay for decommissioning is limited. At least some of the waste is known to exceed NRC's existing radiological criteria for decommissioning. Therefore, NRC is requiring the licensee to remediate the SFC facility to meet the NRC's decommissioning criteria, as described in the SDMP Action Plan (April 16, 1992, 57 FR 13389).

In the Preliminary Plan for the Completion of Decommissioning of February 1993, however, SFC identified on-site disposal using the criteria developed for uranium mill tailings sites (10 CFR part 40, appendix A), as appropriate for the SFC facility because of similarity of materials at the mills and at SFC. The uranium mill tailings criteria exceed the criteria has generally found acceptable for decommissioning nuclear facilities other than uranium mill tailings disposal sites.

The NRC has determined that approval of on-site disposal of the radioactive waste in excess of NRC decommissioning criteria constitutes a major federal action and, therefore, warrants preparation of an EIS in accordance with the National

Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the NRC's implementing requirements in 10 CFR part 51. Concentrations of uranium, at the site exceed NRC's current criteria for allowing release of sites for unrestricted use. These criteria are listed in NRC's Action Plan to Ensure Timely Cleanup of SDMP Sites (57 FR 13389, April 16, 1992). As described in the Action Plan, the criteria are applied on a site-specific basis with emphasis on residual contamination levels that are as low as is reasonably achievable.

Consequently, if NRC approved on-site disposal of the radioactive material, land use restrictions or other institutional controls may be necessary to ensure long-term protection of the public and the environment. NRC expects that SFC would have to apply for and obtain an exemption from NRC's present requirements because NRC's current requirements for decommissioning do not allow for land use restrictions (see definition of Decommissioning in 10 CFR 40.4).

In addition to the issues discussed above that fall under NRC's jurisdiction, there are other environmental issues associated with decommissioning the SFC facility that are regulated by other agencies, including the EPA, which has regulatory authority over hazardous wastes and releases at the facility. The scoping process and EIS will not only aid NRC in reaching decisions about the decommissioning of the SFC facility, but should also be useful to EPA in discharging its duties.

Description of Proposed Action

The proposed action is the construction of a facility to isolate contained materials in an engineered on-site cell and the development of site specific remediation criteria for contamination left in place.

Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement

Under the NEPA, all Federal agencies must consider the effect of their actions on the environment. Section 102(1) of NEPA requires that the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in NEPA. It is the intent of NEPA to have Federal agencies incorporate consideration of environmental issues into their decision-making processes. NRC regulations implementing NEPA are contained in 10 CFR part 51. To fulfill NRC's responsibilities under NEPA, the NRC intends to prepare an EIS that will analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed action, as well as environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action and the costs associated with both the proposed action and the alternatives. All reasonable alternatives to the proposed action will be analyzed. The scope of the EIS includes consideration of both radiological and non-radiological impacts associated with the alternative actions.

This notice announces the NRC's intent to prepare an EIS. The principal intent of the EIS is to provide a document describing environmental consequences that will be available to the Agency's decision makers in reviewing the licensee's remediation proposal and future decommissioning plan for the SFC facility.

The Scoping Process

The Commission's regulations in 10 CFR part 51 contain requirements for conducting a scoping process prior to preparation of an EIS. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.26, whenever the NRC determines that an EIS will be prepared by NRC in connection with a proposed action, NRC will publish a notice of intent in the Federal Register stating that an EIS will be prepared and conduct an appropriate scoping process. In addition, this scoping process may include the holding of a public scoping meeting.

NRC also describes, in 10 CFR 51.27, the content of the notice of intent and requires that the notice describe the proposed action and also, to the extent that sufficient information is available, possible alternatives. In addition, the notice of intent is to describe the proposed scoping process, including the role of participants, whether written comments will be accepted, and whether a public scoping meeting will be held. In accordance with §§ 51.26 and 51.27, the proposed action and possible alternative approaches are discussed below. The role of participants in the scoping process for this EIS includes the following:

(1) Participants may attend and provide oral discussion on the proposed action and possible alternatives at the public scoping meeting at the Gore High School, Gore Oklahoma, on November 15, 1995, from 7 to 10 p.m.

(2) The Commission will also accept written comments on the proposed action and alternatives from the public. Written comments should be submitted by March 29, 1996, and should be sent to: Rules Review and Directives Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. ATTN: Docketing and Services Branch. Hand deliver comments to 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. This comment has been extended compared with the normal duration of such comment periods to allow consideration of additional site characterization information that is expected to be available in December 1995 and January 1996.

According to 10 CFR 51.29, the scoping process is to be used to address the topics which follow. Participants may make written comments, or verbal comments at the scoping meeting, on the following (current preliminary NRC staff approaches with regard to each topic are included for information):

(a) *Define the proposed action to be the subject of the EIS.* The proposed action is the construction of a facility to isolate radioactive materials in an engineered on-site disposal cell and the development of site specific remediation criteria for contamination left in place at the SFC facility in Gore, Oklahoma.

(b) *Determine the scope of the EIS and the significant issues to be analyzed in depth.* The NRC is proposing to analyze the costs and impacts associated with the proposed action and alternative decommissioning approaches. The following proposed outline for the EIS reflects the current NRC staff view on the scope and major topics to be dealt with in the EIS:

Proposed Outline: Environmental Impact Statement

Abstract

Executive Summary

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
   - 1.1 Background
   - 1.2 Purpose and Need for Proposed Action
   - 1.3 Description of Proposed Action
   - 1.4 Approach in Preparation of the Draft EIS
   - 1.5 tructure of the Draft EIS
2. Alternatives including the Proposed Action
   - 2.1 Factors Considered in Evaluating Alternatives
   - 2.2 Alternatives
   - 2.3 Regulatory Compliance
3. Affected Environment
   - 3.1 Introduction
   - 3.2 Description of the SFC facility
   - 3.3 Land Use
   - 3.4 Geology/Seismicity
   - 3.5 Meteorology and Hydrology
   - 3.6 Ecology
   - 3.7 Socioeconomic Characteristics
   - 3.8 Radiation
   - 3.9 Cultural Resources
   - 3.10 Environmental Justice
   - 3.11 Other Environmental Features
4. Decommissioning Alternatives Analyzed and Method of Approach for the Analysis

4.1 General Information on Approach and Method of Analysis of Decommissioning Alternatives
4.2 Alternatives Considered—each of the alternatives represent alternate decommissioning approaches.
(a) Alternative 1, *On-site isolation of radioactive waste in an engineered disposal cell and development of site specific remediation criteria* (Licensee's proposed alternative) This alternative would also likely include land use restrictions and/or other institutional controls to prevent or reduce potential intrusion into the waste and to monitor the long-term effectiveness of the disposal and take mitigative measures as necessary to protect the public and environment.
(b) Alternative 2, *Disposal of radioactive waste at an off-site, licensed facility.* All radioactive wastes above release criteria, including sludge, uranium compounds in the ground, contaminated equipment and structures, scrap materials, and exhumed wastes would be packaged and shipped to a licensed disposal facility.
(c) Alternative 3, *Disposal at new off-site facility.* Disposal of radioactive wastes at an alternate, licensed disposal site authorized in accordance with the NRC's requirements.
(d) Alternative 4, *Above grade, retrievable storage on-site.* All radioactive wastes, in excess of release criteria, would be packaged and stored in a retrievable form in an above grade facility. Institutional controls would continue to apply during the storage period until the waste is removed for disposal.
(e) Alternative 5, *No Action.* This alternative is mandated by NEPA and will identify the impacts of no remediation at the facility.
4.3 Method of Analysis of Alternatives
(a) Define a range of alternatives;
(b) Evaluate the alternative decommissioning approaches with respect to: (1) The incremental impact to workers, members of the public, and the environment, both radiological and nonradiological, resulting from each alternative, and (2) the costs associated with each alternative. Evaluations of impacts and costs are contained in Sections 5 and 6 below;
(c) Perform a comparative evaluation of the decommissioning approaches based on the impacts and costs of each alternative from 4.3(b).
5. Environmental Consequences, Monitoring, and Mitigation
5.1 Construction and Remediation Consequences
5.2 Monitoring Programs
5.3 Mitigation Measures
5.4 Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts
5.5 Relationship between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity
5.6 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources
6. Costs and Benefits Associated with Decommissioning Alternatives
6.1 General
6.2 Quantifiable Socioeconomic Impacts
6.3 The Benefit-Cost Summary
6.4 Staff Assessment
7. List of Preparers
8. List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Receiving Copies of the Draft EIS
9. References
Appendix A—RESERVED FOR COMMENTS ON DEIS
Appendix B—Results of Scoping Process

(c) *Identify and eliminate from detailed study issues which are not significant or which are peripheral or which have been covered by prior environmental review.* The NRC has not yet eliminated any nonsignificant issues. However, NRC is considering elimination of the following issues from the scope of this EIS because they have been previously analyzed in a previous Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) (NUREG–0586) and included in an earlier rulemaking (53 FR 24018, June 28, 1988): (i) planning necessary to conduct decommissioning operations in a safe manner; (ii) the time period in which decommissioning should be completed; and (iii) whether facilities should not be left abandoned, but instead remediated to appropriate levels. In addition, requirements were recently imposed in a separate rulemaking regarding timeliness of decommissioning for 10 CFR parts 30, 40, and 70 licensees (58 FR 4099, January 13, 1993). NRC also proposed establishing radiological criteria for decommissioning, which are supported by a draft generic environmental impact statement (NUREG–1496; 59 FR 43700, August 22, 1994).

(d) *Identify any Environmental Assessments or EISs which are being or will be prepared that are related but are not part of the scope of this EIS.* An Environmental Assessment on the timeliness of decommissioning has been prepared as part of a separate rulemaking on decommissioning timeliness (59 FR 36026; July 15, 1994). NRC has developed a GEIS (NUREG–1496) to support a rulemaking to establish generic radiological criteria for decommissioning (59 FR 43200, August 22, 1994). In addition, NRC is presently developing EIS's for decommissioning projects involving proposals for onsite disposal at sites owned by Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation at Cambridge, Ohio and Newfield, New Jersey; by Babcox and Wilcox at Parks Township, Pennsylvania; and by the U.S. Army at Jefferson Proving Ground, Indiana.

(e) *Identify other environmental review or consultation requirements related to the proposed action.* NRC will consult with other Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies that have jurisdiction over the SFC site decommissioning. For example, NRC has already been coordinating its reviews of decommissioning actions at the SFC facility with EPA Region VI, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Geologic Survey. NRC anticipates continued consultation with these and other agencies, as appropriate, during the development of the EIS.

(f) *Indicate the relationship between the timing of the preparation of environmental analysis and the Commission's tentative planning and decision making schedule.* NRC intends to prepare and issue for public comment a draft EIS in early to mid 1997. The comment period would be for 90 days. The final EIS is scheduled for publication in fall of 1997. This schedule may be impacted by the availability and adequacy of site information. Subsequent to completion of the final EIS, the NRC would review and act on a license amendment from the licensee requesting authorization for decommissioning the site, including the decommissioning plan as required in 10 CFR § 40.42(c)(2).

(g) *Identify cooperating agencies and, as appropriate, assignments and schedules.* The EPA will be invited to be a cooperating agency in this EIS, as will the U.S. Corps of Engineers that is responsible for property adjacent to SFC. The Cherokee Nation, the U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and agencies of the State of Oklahoma will also be invited to participate as cooperating agencies. Specific assignments and schedules will be identified after agency commitments are received and completion of scoping.

(h) *Describe the means by which the EIS will be prepared.* NRC will prepare the draft EIS according to the requirements in 10 CFR part 51. Specifically, in accordance with 10 CFR 51.71, the draft EIS will consider comments submitted to NRC as part of the scoping process and will include a preliminary analysis which considers and balances the environmental and other effects of the proposed action and the alternatives available for reducing or avoiding adverse environmental and other effects, as well as the environmental, economic, technical, and other benefits of the proposed action.

The EIS will be prepared by the NRC staff and an NRC contractor. NRC is arranging a project with Oak Ridge National Laboratory to provide technical assistance in the preparation of the EIS. In addition, NRC anticipates requesting specific information from the licensee to support preparation of the EIS. Any information received from the licensee

related to the EIS will be available for public review, unless the information is protected from public disclosure in accordance with NRC requirements in 10 CFR § 2.790.

In the scoping process, participants are invited to speak or submit written comments, as noted above, on any or all of the areas described above. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.29, at the conclusion of the scoping process, NRC will prepare a concise summary of the determinations and conclusions reached, including the significant issues identified, and will send a copy to each participant in the scoping process.

Dated at Rockville, MD., this 13th day of October 1995.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael F. Weber,

Chief, Decommissioning and Regulatory Issues Branch, Division of Low-Level Waste Management and Decommissioning, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 95–25978 Filed 10–19–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting Agenda

In accordance with the purposes of Sections 29 and 182b. of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2039, 2232b), the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards will hold a meeting on November 2–4, 1995, in Conference Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the Federal Register on Tuesday, August 22, 1995 (60 FR 43619).

Thursday, November 2, 1995

8:30 a.m.–8:45 a.m.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding conduct of the meeting and comment briefly regarding items of current interest. During this session, the Committee will discuss priorities for preparation of ACRS reports.

8:45 a.m.–10:45 a.m.: Watts Bar Unit 1 Operating License Application (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the applicant (Tennessee Valley Authority) on the status of resolution of issues associated with the review of the operating license application for Watts Bar Unit 1 nuclear plant.

Representatives of the public will participate, as appropriate.

11:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m: BWR Core Power Stability/ATWS (Open/Closed)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and BWR Owners Group (BWROG) regarding the proposed revisions to emergency procedure guidelines developed by the BWROG for mitigation of an ATWS event compounded by core power instability.

A portion of this session may be closed to discuss General Electric Nuclear Energy proprietary information applicable to this matter.

1:30 p.m.–3:00 p.m.: Advanced Control Room Design Review Guidelines (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the proposed Revision 1 to NUREG–0700, ''Human-System Interface Design Review Guideline''.

Representatives of the industry will participate, as appropriate.

3:15 p.m.–4:15 p.m.: Reliability of Safety Systems (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the methods/means used by the staff for reviewing the reliability of safety systems.

Representatives of the industry will participate, as appropriate.

4:30 p.m.–6:45 p.m.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports on matters considered during this meeting, as well as a proposed ACRS report on the Resolution of Generic Issue 78, ''Monitoring of Fatigue Transient Limits for the Reactor Coolant System''.

Friday, November 3, 1995

8:30 a.m.–8:35 a.m.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding conduct of the meeting.

8:35 a.m.–9:45 a.m.: Proposed Final Regulatory Guide 1.164, ''Time Response Design Criteria for Safety-Related Operator Actions'' (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding proposed final Regulatory Guide 1.164.

Representatives of the industry will participate, as appropriate.

9:45 a.m.–10:30 a.m.: Report of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee (Open/Closed)—The Committee will hear a report of the Planning and Procedures Subcommittee on matters related to the conduct of ACRS business, and organizational and personnel matters relating to the ACRS staff members.

A portion of this session may be closed to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of this Advisory Committee, and matters the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

10:45 a.m.–11:30 a.m.: Future ACRS Activities (Open)—The Committee will select topics for consideration during future ACRS meetings.

11:30 a.m.–11:45 a.m.: Reconciliation of ACRS Comments and Recommendations (Open)—The Committee will discuss responses expected from the NRC Executive Director for Operations to comments and recommendations included in recent ACRS reports.

11:45 a.m.–12:00 Noon: Subcommittee Activities (Open)—The Committee will hear a report by the Subcommittee Chairman regarding the October 26–27, 1995 meeting on Individual Plant Examinations/ Probabilistic Risk Assessment.

1:00 p.m.–6:30 p.m.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will continue its discussion of proposed ACRS reports on matters considered during this meeting, as well as a proposed ACRS report on the Resolution of Generic Issue 78, ''Monitoring of Fatigue Transient Limits for Reactor Coolant System''.

Saturday, November 4, 1995

8:30 a.m.–10:30 a.m.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will continue its discussion of proposed ACRS reports on matters considered during this meeting and on the other matter noted above.

10:45 a.m.–12 Noon: Strategic Planning (Open)—The Committee will discuss items that are of significant importance to NRC, including rebaselining of the Committee activities for fiscal year 96–97.

12:00 Noon–12:15 p.m.: Miscellaneous (Open)—The Committee will discuss miscellaneous matters related to the conduct of Committee activities.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACRS meetings were published in the Federal Register on October 5, 1994 (59 FR 50780). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, electronic recordings will be permitted only during the open portions of the meeting, and questions may be asked only by members of the Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify Mr. Sam Duraiswamy, Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch, at least five days before the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made